



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,391	03/30/2001	Monte J. Rhoads	42390P11044	7361

8791 7590 02/25/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

LEVI, DAMEON E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2841

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

# Fax Cover Sheet

**Date:** 04 Mar 2003

<b>To:</b> Kerry D. Tweet	<b>From:</b> Dameon E Levi
<b>Application/Control Number:</b> 09/823,391	<b>Art Unit:</b> 2841
<b>Fax No.:</b> (503) 684-3245	<b>Phone No.:</b> (703) 305-0426
<b>Voice No.:</b> (503) 684-6200	<b>Return Fax No.:</b> (703) 308-7724
<b>Re:</b>	<b>CC:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Urgent</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>For Review</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>For Comment</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>For Reply</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Per Your Request</b>	

**Comments:**

Call to verify receipt at 703 305 0426

**Number of pages** \_\_ **including this page**

**STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelop addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/823,391

Applicant(s)

RHOADS, MONTE J.

Examiner

Dameon E Levi

Art Unit

2841

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 13 January 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: 4,15,27 and 51.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-14,16-26,28-46,48-50 and 52-58.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.(s).
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

DAVID MARTIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive over the art of record. The "mounting portion", and "routing portion" as presented in the claims and interpreted by the examiner are still deemed as "a portion or surface that something (in the instant case, a card connector or an electronic device) is mounted on, and an element or device (in the instant case, electronic signals) from one place to another within an electronic system or device..